

Comment on the proposed conservation of the generic and specific names of *Zanclea costata* Gegenbaur, 1856 (Cnidaria, Hydrozoa)
(Case 2806; see BZN 49: 184–186)

B.P. Haldar

Zoological Survey of India, 27 J.L. Nehru Road, Calcutta 700 016, India

I support the application to conserve the generic and specific names of *Zanclea costata*, both of Gegenbaur (1856), which are widely used. *Z. costata* has appeared frequently in the primary literature (to my knowledge at least 25 times since its description) whilst the senior synonym *Mnestra parasites* Krohn, 1853, used for a deformed, parasitized medusa, has appeared only six or seven times since 1853. Rees (1953) was the first to point out that the latter taxon is probably identical with *Z. costata*. To replace *Zanclea* by *Mnestra*, or by *Acrochordium* Meyen, 1834, and *costata* by *parasites* would create real and unnecessary confusion, particularly for non-specialists. Moreover, the substitutions would not take effect for several decades because many marine ecologists would continue to use the old terminology.

Out of six nominal species of *Zanclea* at least three have been synonymised with *Z. costata*, which is circumtropical and very common.

Comment on the proposed confirmation of unavailability of the name *Fusus* Helbling, 1779 (Mollusca, Gastropoda)

(Case 2729; see BZN 48: 92–96, 244–246; 49: 68–70, 221–222, 289)

Marco Oliverio

Dipartimento di Biologia Animale e dell'Uomo, Università di Roma 'La Sapienza', Viale dell'Università 32, I-00185 Rome, Italy

I should like to comment on the case of *Fusus* Helbling, 1779 and to support with observational data the comments by Beu, Marshall & Ponder (BZN 49: 68–70).

The protoconch characters which were used by Beu & Maxwell (1987) to separate the Indo-Pacific species of *Colubraria* on the one hand from the Mediterranean *C. reticularia* (Blainville, [1829]), which is probably the *Fusus intertextus* of Helbling (1779), on the other are not adequately diagnostic. A second *Colubraria*-like species has recently been found in the Mediterranean (Oliverio & Tringali, 1991). In the two closely related Mediterranean species both types of protoconch are represented, confirming Beu, Marshall & Ponder's statement (BZN 49: 69) that protoconch characters cannot be used to separate the Mediterranean species from the Indo-Pacific group at any supraspecific level. Moreover I have observed that the well known *C. reticulata* (or *Fusus intertextus*: see BZN 48: 93, paras. 5 and 6) lacks a radula, which further suggests its close relationship to the Indo-Pacific *Colubraria* species.

The suppression of the name *Fusus* Helbling, 1779 except for purposes of homonymy, as proposed by Beu, Marshall & Ponder (BZN 49: 69), would prevent it displacing the well established *Colubraria* Schumacher, 1817, a name in use for many species. As pointed out by Petit & Wilson (BZN 48: 92–96 and 49: 221–222) the name *Fusus* has in the past been used in different senses. Adoption of it either for the

Colubraria group (following the sense of Helbling, 1779) or for *Fusinus* species (following that of Bruguière, 1789) would be potentially confusing. The suppression proposed by Beu, Marshall & Ponder conserves *Colubraria* and also protects the widely used *Fusinus* Rafinesque, 1815 from its senior synonym *Fusus* Bruguière, 1789. Adoption of this course seems to me to be the best solution of this case.

Additional reference

Oliverio, M. & Tringali, L. 1991. *Fusus intertextus* and (?)*Fusus* sp. in the Mediterranean Sea (Neogastropoda; Buccinidae; Pisaninae). *Notiziario Centro Italiano Studi Malacologici*, 13-14: 38-40.

Comment on the proposed precedence of *Taningia danae* Joubin, 1931 (Mollusca, Cephalopoda) over *T. persica* (Naef, 1923)
(Case 2845; see BZN 49: 261-263)

Malcolm R. Clarke

Ridge Court, Court Road, Newton Ferrers, Plymouth PL8 1DD, Devon, U.K.

The application by Vecchione & Roper is a sensible way out of a problem, and I support all their proposals.

Comment on the proposed attribution of the specific name of *Ceratites nodosus* (Mollusca, Ammonoidea) to Schlotheim, 1813, with the designation of a lectotype
(Case 2732; see BZN 48: 31-35, 246; 49: 145-149, 290; 50: 54-56)

N.J. Silberling

U.S. Geological Survey, MS-919, Box 25046, Federal Center, Denver, Colorado 80225, U.S.A.

In supporting Urlichs's application regarding *Ceratites nodosus*, Hahn (BZN 48: 246) states that acceptance of the proposals will conserve the name 'as used today'. In further support, Tichy (BZN 49: 290) says that acceptance will 'conserve the established usage of the name *nodosus*'. Their comments create the impression that Urlichs's proposal will stabilize a taxonomic usage that has been established for a long time, but this view cannot be defended. The first major work dealing with *Ceratites nodosus* was Philippi (1901). In this the species is cited as '*Ceratites nodosus* (Brug.) Schloth.'. Bruguière's description of the taxon is in Philippi's synonymy and the illustration by Scheuchzer (1718) is given as the first published of the species. It is the specimen on which this drawing was based which, contrary to Urlichs's proposal, was designated as the lectotype for *Ceratites nodosus* (Bruguière) by Rieber & Tozer (1986). Bruguière is also cited as the author of the species in the comprehensive works which provide a synonymy of *C. nodosus* (Riedel, 1916; Spath, 1934; Penndorf, 1951; Wenger, 1957). The taxonomic usage defended by Hahn as being currently used was only initiated by Urlichs and Mundlos in 1987, hardly long enough ago to have originated a history of 'established usage' as referred to by Tichy. The complaint by Tichy that acceptance of Tozer's proposal (BZN 49: 148) will